UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,275	07/14/2003	L. Lloyd Williams	SWA01 P-106	6325

28101 7590 03/28/2006

VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN AND BURKHART, LLP
2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E.
P.O. BOX 888695
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695

EXAMINER	
ANWAH, OLISA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2614	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,275	WILLIAMS, L. LLOYD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olisa Anwah	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 December 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-15* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16-40* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *33 and 35* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 33 is objected to because the term "signaling initial address message (IAM)" in line 2 should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claim 35 is objected to because the term "directory" in line 14 should be replaced with "directory number". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,369 (hereinafter Petrunka) combined with Dammrose et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,922,468 (hereinafter Dammrose) in further view

of Kasiviswanathan, U.S. Patent No. 6,215,857 (hereinafter Kasiviswanathan).

Regarding claim 16, Petrunka discloses a system (see Figure 3) for enabling a requesting party (see unit 30 from Figure 3) to initiate a telephone call directly to a voice mail box (see unit 39 from Figure 3) associated with a service subscriber (see unit 38 from Figure 3) to a voice mail system (VMS), comprising:

a call control node (see unit 32 from Figure 3) configured as a service switching point in a switched telephone network (see Figure 3), the call control node (see unit 32 from Figure 3) being adapted to receive a connection request message (see step 434 from Figure 4) sent through a data packet network (see the data links "----" disclosed in Figure 3) in response to a request (see step 432 from Figure 4) to access the voice mail box (see unit 39 from Figure 3) by a calling party (see unit 30 from Figure 3), the connection request message (see step 434 from Figure 4) requesting setup of a direct call from the calling party (see unit 30 from Figure 3) to a voice mail box (see unit 39 from Figure 3) of the service subscriber (see unit 38 from Figure 3), and to respond to the connection request message (see step 434 from Figure 4) by formulating all call set-up messages required to establish the direct call from the calling party (see unit 30 from Figure 3) to the VMS (see unit

39 from Figure 3), so that the VMS (see unit 39 from Figure 3) provides access to the voice mail box (see step 446 from Figure 4).

Petrunka fails to teach the call control node is a configured as a virtual service switching point. Nonetheless, Dammrose discloses this limitation (see column 9). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Petrunka with the virtual service switching point taught by Dammrose. This modification would have improved the convenience of Petrunka by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by both Dammrose (see column 9) and Petrunka (see step 450 from Figure 4).

Further regarding claim 16, the combination of Petrunka and Dammrose does not explicitly state one of the call set-up messages having a format reserved for redirected call set-up messages used by service switching points (SSPs) to redirect uncompleted calls to the service subscriber. All the same, Kasiviswanathan discloses this limitation (see column 5). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the combination of Petrunka and Dammrose with the call set-up messages of Kasiviswanathan. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by utilizing AIN technology as suggested by Petrunka (see column 4).

On the issue of claim 17, see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan.

5. Claims 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan in further view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

The combination of Petrunka, Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan teaches a means for formulating an IAM including a called party number parameter and a redirecting number parameter in conformance with the SS7 standard (see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan). However this combination falls short of showing the directory number of the VMS is inserted in the called party number parameter and a directory number of the VMS service subscriber is inserted in the redirecting number parameter of the IAM. However paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's specification admits this limitation is well known in the art. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further alter the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose and Kasiviswanathan with the parameters admitted by Applicant. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing other information to be included in the IAM as suggested by Kasiviswanathan (see column 5).

On the issue of claim 19, see paragraph 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 20, see Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 21, see column 9 of Dammrose, Figure 4 of Petrunka and paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 22, see Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 23, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 24, see column 9 of Dammrose, column 5 of Kasiviswanathan and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

6. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in further view of Tov.

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art fails to teach the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this mechanism (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka, Dammrose, Kasiviswanathan and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art with the server disclosed by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 26, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 27, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 28, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claim 29, see paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's disclosure.

7. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka in view of Kasiviswanathan.

Regarding claim 30, Petrunka teaches a system for providing a directory service (see abstract) with a direct to voice mail

option (see step 428 from Figure 4) for a voice mail system (VMS) service subscribers (see unit 38 from Figure 3), comprising:

a directory service (see abstract) that permits a requesting party (see unit 30 from Figure 3) to communicate an identifier (see step 404 from Figure 4) used to locate a directory record (see step 408 from Figure 4) associated with the VMS service subscriber (see unit 38 from Figure 3), the directory service (see abstract) being adapted to provide the requesting party with an option to be connected directly to the VMS service subscriber's voice mail box after the record is located (see step 428 from Figure 4); and

a call control node (see unit 32 from Figure 3) for formulating a release message (see step 436 from Figure 4) to release a part of the call connection between the call control node (see unit 32 from Figure 3) and the directory service (see abstract) and to formulate a second message (see 434 from Figure 4) containing a redirecting number parameter to extend the call connection from the call control node (see unit 32 from Figure 3) to the VMS (see unit 39 from Figure 3) to connect (see 446 from Figure 4) the requesting party (see unit 30 from Figure 3) directly to the voice mail box (see unit 39 from Figure 3) of the VMS service subscriber (see unit 38 from Figure 3).

Further regarding claim 30, Petrunka does not explicitly mention the release message is a common channel signaling message. Petrunka also fails to teach the second message is an initial address message. All the same, Kasiviswanathan discloses these limitations (see column 5). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Petrunka with the call set-up messages of Kasiviswanathan. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by utilizing AIN technology as suggested by Petrunka (see column 4).

On the subject of claim 31, see Figure 4 of Petrunka.

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan in view of Tov.

With respect to claim 32, the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan does not disclose the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan with the web page

taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

9. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan in view of Dammrose.

On the issue of claim 33, the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan teaches the call control node is a call control node (CCN) that is configured as a switching point in the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and a physical node in a common channel signaling network of the PSTN (see column 5 of Kasiviswanathan).

The combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan fails to teach the call control node is a configured as a virtual service switching point. Nonetheless, Dammrose discloses this limitation (see column 9). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Petrunka and Kasiviswanathan with the virtual service switching point taught by Dammrose. This modification would have improved system's convenience by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by Dammrose.

10. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose in further view of Tov.

Regarding claim 34 the combination of Petrunka, Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose doesn't teach the claimed Internet Protocol (IP) network. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka, Kasiviswanathan and Dammrose with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

11. Claims 35, 36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tov combined with Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in further view of Maupin et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,689,548 (hereinafter Maupin).

Regarding claim 35, Tov discloses a system for providing a click to voice mail option accessed from a server on an internet protocol (IP) network, comprising:

a user interface for permitting a requesting party to select the click to voice mail option, the click to voicemail

option being associated with a particular voice mail box of a voice mail system (VMS) subscriber; and

the server being adapted to forward an IP data message requesting setup of a connection directly to the voice mail box to a call control node connected to the IP network; and

the call control node being adapted to receive the message and to launch a call from the call control node to the VMS (see paragraph 0041).

Although Tov launches a call from the call control node to the VMS (see paragraph 0041), Tov does not explicitly mention formulating an IAM containing a directory number of the VMS inserted in a called party number parameter of the IAM and a directory number of the VMS service subscriber inserted in the redirecting number parameter of the IAM. However paragraphs 0005 through 0007 of Applicant's specification admits this limitation is well known in the art. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tov with the parameters admitted by Applicant. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Tov by allowing the visitor to be the connected to the subscriber via a voice or multimedia call as suggested by Tov (see paragraph 0041).

With further respect to claim 35, the combination of Tov and Applicant's admission does not show formulating another common channel signaling system initial address message (IAM) containing a directory number of the requesting party to launch a call from the call control node to the requesting party. Nonetheless, Maupin shows this feature (see column 4). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Tov and Applicant's admission with the IAM message of Maupin. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Tov by allowing the visitor to be the connected to the subscriber via a voice or multimedia call as suggested by Tov (see paragraph 0041).

Regarding claim 36, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 38, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 39, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 40, see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

12. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tov combined with Applicant's Admitted Prior and Maupin in further view of Dammrose.

As for claim 37, the primary references show the CCN is configured as a physical node in the common channel signaling network (see Applicant's admission). However the primary references fail to show the CCN is configured as a virtual switching point in a switched telephone network associated with the common channel signaling network. Nonetheless, Dammrose discloses this limitation (see column 9). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the primary references with the virtual switch mentioned by Dammrose. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by monitoring communications for the purpose of service billing as suggested by Dammrose (see column 9).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

OA

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
March 17, 2006

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600